Dedicated to the 75-th Birthday
of Prof. A.A.Slavnov

INR-TH-2014-012

The NSVZ β-function in supersymmetric theories with different regularizations and renormalization prescriptions

A.L.Kataev
Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Science,
117312, Moscow, Russia,

K.V.Stepanyantz
Moscow State University, Faculty of Physics, Department of Theoretical Physics
119991, Moscow, Russia

May 30, 2014

arXiv:1405.7598v1 [hep-th] 29 May 2014

Abstract

We briefly review the calculations of quantum corrections related with the exact NSVZ β-function in $\mathcal{N}=1$ supersymmetric theories, paying especial attention to the scheme dependence of the results. It is explained, how the NSVZ relation is obtained for the renormalization group functions defined in terms of the bare coupling constant if a theory is regularized by higher derivatives. Also we describe, how to construct a special renormalization prescription which gives the NSVZ relation for the renormalization group functions defined in terms of the renormalized coupling constant exactly in all orders for Abelian supersymmetric theories, regularized by higher derivatives. The scheme dependence of the NSVZ β-function (for the renormalization group functions defined in terms of the renormalized coupling constant) is discussed in the non-Abelian case. It is shown that in this case the NSVZ β-function leads to a certain scheme-independent equality.

1 Introduction

$\mathcal{N}=1$ supersymmetric gauge theories are interesting from both theoretical and phenomenological point of view. The exact NSVZ β-function relates the β-function of these theories with the anomalous dimension of the matter superfields. For theories containing chiral matter superfields the NSVZ relation has the following form

$$\beta(\alpha) = -\frac{\alpha^2\Big(3C_2 - T(R) + C(R)_i{}^j\gamma_j{}^i(\alpha)/r\Big)}{2\pi(1-C_2\alpha/2\pi)}, \tag{1}$$

where the variable α denotes the argument in this relation. Depending on the definition of the renormalization group functions, this argument can be either the renormalized coupling constant, or the bare coupling constant. In Eq. (1) the following notation is used:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{tr}\,(T^A T^B) \equiv T(R)\,\delta^{AB}; \qquad && (T^A)_i{}^k (T^A)_k{}^j \equiv C(R)_i{}^j;\\ &f^{ACD} f^{BCD} \equiv C_2 \delta^{AB}; && r \equiv \delta_{AA}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where C_2 and $C(R)_i{}^j$ are the quadratic Casimir operators, $2T(R)$ is the Dynkin index of the representation R, and r is a dimension of the gauge group. For the pure $\mathcal{N}=1$ Yang–Mills theory the expression (1) gives the exact β-function, which appears to be a geometric progression.

The NSVZ β-function was constructed in Refs. [1, 2] using arguments based on the structure of instanton constributions, namely, by requiring their renormalization group invariance (for a review, see Ref. [3]). Also it was derived in Refs. [4, 5] using the arguments based on anomalies. It is known that in supersymmetric theories the axial anomaly and the anomaly of the energy-momentum trace belong to the same supermultiplet. The axial anomaly is contributed only by the one-loop approximation, while the anomaly of the energy-momentum trace is proportional to a β-function. Accurately analyzing these facts, it is possible to obtain the NSVZ β-function. This analysis is rather nontrivial. For example, according to Ref. [6] the multiplication of the matter superfields by the renormalization constant Z changes the divergences in supersymmetric theories. This rescaling anomaly can be used for explaining the origin of the higher order corrections in the NSVZ β-function. In the Abelian case the NSVZ expression was first derived in Refs. [7, 8]. In Ref. [9] the NSVZ β-function was found using the non-renormalization theorem for the topological term and the Slavnov–Taylor identities [10, 11].

The NSVZ β-function relates different divergent contributions to the effective action in an interesting and nontrivial way. In particular, it can be used for proving the finiteness of $\mathcal{N}=2$ supersymmetric theories beyond the one-loop approximation [1, 3, 12]. The NSVZ β-function can be also used for investigating the possibility of constructing finite $\mathcal{N}=1$ supersymmetric gauge theories [3]. The exact relations similar to the NSVZ β-function can be written in theories with the soft supersymmetry breaking for the renormalization of the gaugino mass [13, 14, 15]. However, in this paper we will not discuss them.

Although the NSVZ β-function was constructed a long time ago, it was not clear, how it can be derived using the explicit calculations of Feynman diagrams and what renormalization prescription should be used in order to obtain it. Thus, up to now investigation of the NSVZ relation remains an actual problem. In this paper we briefly review various calculations which are related with this problem and describe the scheme in which the NSVZ β-function is obtained with the higher derivative regularization, proposed by A.A.Slavnov [17, 18], in the Abelian case. Moreover, we find how the NSVZ β-function is changed under the finite renormalizations in the non-Abelian case and derive a scheme independent consequence of the NSVZ relation.

2 The NSVZ relation for the renormalization group functions defined in terms of the bare coupling constant

One of the first derivations of the NSVZ β-function was made in Ref. [1] by requiring the renormalization group invariance of the instanton contributions. It should be noted that in Ref. [1] the NSVZ relation was written for the β-function defined in terms of the bare coupling constant. The same definition was also used in Refs. [2, 7, 8, 6, 16].

In terms of the bare coupling constant the β-function and the anomalous dimension are defined as

$$\beta\Big(\alpha_0(\alpha,\Lambda/\mu)\Big) \equiv \frac{d\alpha_0(\alpha,\Lambda/\mu)}{d\ln\Lambda}\Big|_{\alpha=\mathrm{const}}; \tag{3}$$

$$\gamma_i{}^j\Big(\alpha_0(\alpha,\Lambda/\mu)\Big) \equiv -\frac{d\ln Z_i{}^j(\alpha,\Lambda/\mu)}{d\ln\Lambda}\Big|_{\alpha=\mathrm{const}}, \tag{4}$$

where Λ is a dimensionful regularization parameter and μ is a renormalization scale. For calculating these renormalization group functions the left hand side is considered as a function of the bare coupling constant and the limit $\Lambda \to \infty$ is not taken. In addition to the regularization, it is necessary to choose a prescription for constructing the function $\alpha(\alpha_0, \Lambda/\mu)$ and the renormalization constant $Z_i{}^j$. By other words, it is necessary to choose a renormalization scheme.

The renormalization group functions (3) and (4) considered as functions of the bare coupling constant are scheme independent, because it is possible to express them in terms of the unrenormalized Green functions. Nevertheless, these functions depend on the regularization. However, in the early papers this dependence was not investigated. A different definition of the renormalization group functions (in terms of the renormalized coupling constant) was used in Refs. [5, 9].

The NSVZ relation for the renormalization group functions (3) and (4) appeared again in papers devoted to calculations of quantum corrections with the higher covariant derivative regularization [17, 18]. This regularization also includes insertion of Pauli–Villars determinants for removing the one-loop divergences [19]. It is consistent and (in supersymmetric theories) can be formulated in a manifestly supersymmetric way [20, 21]. However, it produces complicated loop integrals. Due to this reason explicit calculation of the one-loop β-function for the (non-supersymmetric) Yang–Mills theory with the higher covariant derivative regularization [22] was made much later than the calculation with the dimensional regularization [23, 24]. After corrections made in [25, 26] the results for the β-function in both regularizations coincide, as it should be [27].[1] In supersymmetric theories regularized by higher covariant derivatives the integrals defining the β-function (3) appear to be integrals of total derivatives [28, 29] and even integrals of double total derivatives [30, 31]. This allows to calculate one of loop integrals analytically and to obtain the NSVZ relation between the β-function and the anomalous dimensions of the matter superfields. For the Abelian supersymmetric gauge theories this feature was proved exactly in all loops in Ref. [32] by explicit summation of supergraphs and in Ref. [33] using a method based on the Schwinger–Dyson equations. Calculations with the higher covariant derivative regularization for the non-Abelian supersymmetric gauge theories were made only in the one- and two-loop approximations [29]. They reveal exactly the same features as in the Abelian case, namely, the factorization of integrals for the β-function (3) into integrals of (double) total derivatives. This factorization is a reason for appearing the NSVZ relation in supersymmetric theories for the renormalization group functions defined in terms of the bare coupling constant. This feature takes place in case of using the higher covariant derivative regularization, and it is not so far clear, if it is valid for other regularizations. Thus, the choice of the higher covariant derivative regularization is very important.

3 Scheme dependence of the NSVZ β-function

In quantum field theory the renormalization group functions are usually defined in a different way [34], in terms of the renormalized coupling constant:

$$\widetilde{\beta}\Big(\alpha(\alpha_0, \Lambda/\mu)\Big) \equiv \frac{d\alpha(\alpha_0, \Lambda/\mu)}{d\ln\mu}\Big|_{\alpha_0=\mathrm{const}}; \tag{5}$$

$$\widetilde{\gamma}_i{}^j\Big(\alpha(\alpha_0, \Lambda/\mu)\Big) \equiv \frac{d\ln Z_i{}^j(\alpha(\alpha_0, \Lambda/\mu), \Lambda/\mu)}{d\ln\mu}\Big|_{\alpha_0=\mathrm{const}}. \tag{6}$$

[1] The result of Ref. [22] was different, the correct result for the one-loop β-function was found later.

It is well known that the renormalization group functions (5) and (6) are scheme dependent unlike the functions (3) and (4).

There are a lot of papers in which the renormalization group functions (5) and (6) are calculated for supersymmetric theories in the low orders of the perturbation theory. The exact NSVZ β-function can be compared with the results of these calculations. Usually, most of perturbative calculations in non-supersymmetric theories are made using the dimensional regularization [35, 36, 37, 38]. This regularization was also used for calculating the β-function in supersymmetric theories in one- [39] and two-loop [40] approximations. (In these approximations the β-function is scheme-independent, so that the result is the same as in the case of using other regularizations, in particular, the dimensional reduction [41].) Since the dimensional regularization breaks the supersymmetry, it is not convenient to use it in supersymmetric theories.[2] That is why supersymmetric theories are mostly regularized by the dimensional reduction, which is not, however, mathematically consistent [46]. Removing of the inconsistencies cannot be made without loss of supersymmetry [47, 48]. Nevertheless, the calculations with the dimensional reduction in the $\overline{\rm DR}$-scheme (which is a modification of the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme [49]) were made in various supersymmetric theories. In the $\mathcal{N}=4$ supersymmetric Yang–Mills theory the three- [50] and four-loop [51] calculations demonstrate vanishing of the β-function. Moreover, the dimensional reduction does not break supersymmetry even in the four-loop approximation [51], although it is possible in higher loops. The β-function of the pure $\mathcal{N}=2$ supersymmetric Yang–Mills theory vanishes at the three-loops [50], but supersymmetry is broken in this approximation [52, 53]. (The calculation in Ref. [52] was corrected in [53].) At present, it is still not clear whether this is related with the inconsistency of the dimensional reduction, or with using a non-supersymmetric gauge condition, or with some other reason. For $\mathcal{N}=1$ supersymmetric theories a β-function was calculated in the three- [50, 54] and four-loop [55, 56] approximations, see Ref. [57] for a recent review. The results do not agree with the NSVZ β-function starting from the three-loop approximation, where the scheme dependence becomes essential. Some consequences of this difference are discussed in Ref. [58]. However, the NSVZ β-function can be obtained after a special tuning of the subtraction scheme which should be made in every order of the perturbation theory [54, 59, 60]. The corresponding finite renormalization of the coupling constant can be found by investigating theories with the softly broken supersymmetry [60]. Therefore, there is a question, how to formulate a prescription which gives the NSVZ scheme in supersymmetric theories in all orders of the perturbation theory. The answer can be found using a different regularization for which the NSVZ scheme can be formulated explicitly. Note that other regularizations were used mainly for calculations in the one- and two-loop approximations. We can mention Ref. [61] in which the two-loop β-function of the $\mathcal{N}=1$ supersymmetric Yang–Mills theory was calculated using a version of the differential renormalization [62], proposed in [63], which does not break supersymmetry [64]. In Ref. [65] the two-loop β-function for the $\mathcal{N}=1$ supersymmetric electrodynamics was found by using the operator product expansion and a cutoff in the coordinate space. Since a two-loop β-function is scheme independent in theories with a single coupling constant, these results cannot be used for investigating the scheme dependence. For completeness, we also mention a regularization based on using $\mathcal{N}=4$ or finite $\mathcal{N}=2$ supersymmetric Yang–Mills theories and introducing a cutoff breaking supersymmetry to $\mathcal{N}=1$. This regularization was used in Ref. [6]. However, it cannot be applied for general $\mathcal{N}=1$ supersymmetric theories.

Quantum corrections also appear in instanton calculations [66]. Finding them one again encounters a scheme dependence of the results. In supersymmetric theories instanton contributions were obtained taking into account quantum corrections up to the two-loop order [67] using the regularization by the dimensional reduction. The result confirmed the argumentation

[2] In general, using of non-invariant regularizations is possible, if they are supplemented by special renormalization prescriptions which restore the Slavnov–Taylor identities [42, 43, 44, 45].

Subtraction scheme	1-loop	2-loop	3-loop	
Overall factor	$\alpha^2 N_f/\pi$	$\alpha^3 N_f/\pi^2$	$\alpha^4 N_f/\pi^3$	$\alpha^4 (N_f)^2/\pi^3$
$\overline{\rm DR}$	1	1	$-1/2$	$-3/4$
HD + NSVZ	1	1	$-1/2$	$-1-\sum_{I=1}^n c_I \ln a_I$
MOM	1	1	$-1/2$	$-3(1-\zeta(3))/2$

Table 1: β-function for the $\mathcal{N}=1$ supersymmetric electrodynamics with N_f flavors in different subtraction schemes. (For the MOM scheme the results obtained with the dimensional reduction and with the higher derivative regularization coincide.)

Subtraction scheme	1-loop	2-loop	
Overall factor	α/π	α^2/π^2	$\alpha^2 N_f/\pi^2$
$\overline{\rm DR}$	-1	$1/2$	$1/2$
HD + NSVZ	-1	$1/2$	$1+\sum_{I=1}^n c_I \ln a_I$
MOM	-1	$1/2$	$1/2$

Table 2: The anomalous dimension of the matter superfields for the $\mathcal{N}=1$ supersymmetric electrodynamics with N_f flavors in different subtraction schemes. (For the MOM scheme the results obtained with the dimensional reduction and with the higher derivative regularization coincide.)

proposed in Ref. [1] for derivation of the NSVZ β-function, namely, vanishing of quantum corrections to the vacuum energy in the instanton background. This implies that the calculation of quantum corrections near the instanton background agrees with the NSVZ expression at the two-loop level. Although in this approximation the β-function defined in terms of the renormalized coupling constant is scheme-independent, the investigation of the instanton correction structure reveals a possibility of the scheme-dependence in higher orders [68, 69]. Therefore, a similar problem of the scheme-dependence is also present for instanton calculations. Unfortunately, explicit instanton calculations which take into account three-loop corrections are not yet made.

4 NSVZ scheme

In all orders the NSVZ scheme has been naturally constructed using the higher covariant derivative regularization at least in the Abelian case [70, 71]. As we have already mentioned above, with the dimensional reduction there is no general prescription which allows to obtain such a scheme in all orders. However, if the $\mathcal{N}=1$ supersymmetric electrodynamics with an arbitrary (N_f) number of flavors is regularized by higher derivatives, this can be done by a special choice of the subtraction scheme. Namely, the NSVZ scheme is constructed by imposing the boundary conditions

$$Z_3(\alpha, x_0) = 1; \qquad Z(\alpha, x_0) = 1 \tag{7}$$

on the renormalization constants for the coupling constant and the matter superfield, respectively, where x_0 is a certain (arbitrary) value of $x = \ln\Lambda/\mu$. In this case the renormalization group functions (5) and (6) defined in terms of the renormalized coupling constant coincide with the renormalization group functions (3) and (4) defined in terms of the bare coupling constant [70]. The explicit three-loop calculations in this case were made for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric electrodynamics with N_f flavors [71]. It is expedient to compare the result with the corresponding calculations made with other regularizations and subtraction schemes. The results for the β-function and the anomalous dimension of the matter superfields are presented in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. For the NSVZ scheme obtained with the higher derivative regularization c_I denote degrees of the Pauli–Villars determinants, which are introduced in order to cancel one-loop divergences according to Ref. [72], and $a_I = M_I/\Lambda$ are ratios of the Pauli–Villars masses to the parameter in higher derivative term. (It is essential that a_I should not depend on the bare coupling constant.) These tables were constructed using the results of [54, 71]. From them we see that the NSVZ relation for the considered theory,

$$\beta(\alpha) = \frac{\alpha^2 N_f}{\pi}\Big(1 - \gamma(\alpha)\Big), \tag{8}$$

is valid in all schemes in one- and two-loop approximations. Moreover, in the three-loop approximation the terms proportional to $\alpha^4 N_f$ in the β-function and proportional to $\alpha^2(N_f)^0$ in the anomalous dimension are the same in all schemes and satisfy the NSVZ relation. This is a consequence of the scheme-independence of such terms, which was proved in [71] in all orders and is discussed below. The terms proportional to $\alpha^4(N_f)^2$ in the β-function and the corresponding terms in the anomalous dimension satisfy the NSVZ relation only in the NSVZ scheme.

5 Scheme dependence of the NSVZ β-function in the Abelian and non-Abelian cases

Terms of the first degree in N_f in the β-function and terms without N_f in the anomalous dimension are scheme-independent not only in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric electrodynamics with N_f flavors. The same statement is also valid in the scalar and spinor electrodynamics with N_f flavors. Really, under the finite renormalizations

$$\alpha \to \alpha'(\alpha); \qquad Z'(\alpha', \Lambda/\mu) = z(\alpha) Z(\alpha, \Lambda/\mu), \tag{9}$$

the renormalization group functions defined in terms of the renormalized coupling constant are changed as follows:

$$\widetilde{\beta}'(\alpha') = \frac{d\alpha'}{d\ln\mu}\Big|_{\alpha_0=\mathrm{const}} = \frac{d\alpha'}{d\alpha}\widetilde{\beta}(\alpha); \tag{10}$$

$$\widetilde{\gamma}'(\alpha') = \frac{d\ln {Z'}_i^{\,j}}{d\ln\mu}\Big|_{\alpha_0=\mathrm{const}} = \frac{d\ln z}{d\alpha}\cdot\widetilde{\beta}(\alpha) + \widetilde{\gamma}(\alpha), \tag{11}$$

and in the case of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric electrodynamics with N_f flavors $\widetilde{\beta}(\alpha)$ and $\alpha'(\alpha) - \alpha$ are proportional at least to N_f. The scheme-independence of the considered terms is in agreement with the four- [73] and five-loop [74] calculations in the $\overline{\mathrm{MS}}$ and MOM schemes for the quantum electrodynamics with N_f flavors.[3] Also the scheme independence of the considered

[3]For $N_f = 1$ the five-loop results of Ref. [74] coincide with the results of Ref. [75], which confirms their correctness.

terms can be seen comparing the three-loop results for the scalar electrodynamics in the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme [76, 77] and the on-shell scheme [76].

For a general non-Abelian supersymmetric Yang–Mills theory finite renormalizations can also include Yukawa couplings λ^{ijk} (which are totally symmetric in indexes ijk):

$$\alpha \to \alpha'(\alpha,\lambda); \qquad \lambda \to \lambda'(\alpha,\lambda); \qquad Z'_i{}^j(\alpha',\lambda',\Lambda/\mu) = z_i{}^k(\alpha,\lambda) Z_k{}^j(\alpha,\lambda,\Lambda/\mu), \tag{12}$$

where we assume that z and Z commute. Then the generalization of Eqs. (10) and (11) has the form

$$\widetilde{\beta}'(\alpha',\lambda') = \frac{\partial\alpha'}{\partial\alpha}\widetilde{\beta}(\alpha,\lambda) + \frac{3}{2}\Big(\lambda^{ljk}\,\widetilde{\gamma}_l{}^i(\alpha,\lambda)\,\frac{\partial\alpha'}{\partial\lambda^{ijk}} + \lambda^*_{ljk}\,\widetilde{\gamma}_i{}^l(\alpha,\lambda)\,\frac{\partial\alpha'}{\partial\lambda^*_{ijk}}\Big); \tag{13}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\gamma}'_i{}^j(\alpha',\lambda') &= \widetilde{\gamma}_i{}^j(\alpha,\lambda) + \frac{\partial \ln z_i{}^j}{\partial\alpha}\cdot\widetilde{\beta}(\alpha,\lambda)\\ &+\frac{3}{2}\Big(\lambda^{lmn}\,\widetilde{\gamma}_l{}^k(\alpha,\lambda)\,\frac{\partial \ln z_i{}^j}{\partial\lambda^{kmn}} + \lambda^*_{lmn}\,\widetilde{\gamma}_k{}^l(\alpha,\lambda)\,\frac{\partial \ln z_i{}^j}{\partial\lambda^*_{kmn}}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Note that deriving this equation we took into account that according to the non-renormalization theorem [78] there are no divergent quantum corrections to the superpotential. As a consequence, renormalization constants for the Yakawa couplings can be expressed via the renormalization constants $Z_i{}^j$ for the chiral superfields:

$$\lambda^{ijk} = \lambda_0^{mnp}(Z^{1/2})_m{}^i(Z^{1/2})_n{}^j(Z^{1/2})_p{}^k, \tag{15}$$

where λ_0 and λ denote the bare and renormalized Yukawa couplings, respectively. λ' is given by a similar expression which involves the renormalization constant Z'.

Let us assume that in the non-Abelian case the β-function $\widetilde{\beta}(\alpha,\lambda)$ and the anomalous dimension $\widetilde{\gamma}_i{}^j(\alpha,\lambda)$ defined in terms of the renormalized coupling constant satisfy the NSVZ relation. Then we obtain that after the finite renormalization (12)

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\beta}'(\alpha',\lambda') = -\frac{\alpha^2}{2\pi(1-C_2\alpha/2\pi)\partial\alpha/\partial\alpha' - \alpha^2 C(R)_l{}^k\partial\ln z_k{}^l/\partial\ln\alpha'}\Bigg\{3C_2 - T(R)\\ +\frac{1}{r}C(R)_m{}^n\left[\widetilde{\gamma}'_n{}^m(\alpha',\lambda') - \frac{3}{2}\left((\lambda')^{ljk}\,\widetilde{\gamma}'_l{}^i(\alpha',\lambda')\,\frac{\partial\ln z_n{}^m}{\partial(\lambda')^{ijk}} + (\lambda')^*_{ljk}\,\widetilde{\gamma}'_i{}^l(\alpha',\lambda')\,\frac{\partial\ln z_n{}^m}{\partial(\lambda')^*_{ijk}}\right)\right]\\ +\frac{3}{2}\cdot\frac{2\pi}{\alpha^2}\Big(1-C_2\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\Big)\left((\lambda')^{ljk}\,\widetilde{\gamma}'_l{}^i(\alpha',\lambda')\,\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial(\lambda')^{ijk}} + (\lambda')^*_{ljk}\,\widetilde{\gamma}'_i{}^l(\alpha',\lambda')\,\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial(\lambda')^*_{ijk}}\right)\Bigg\}_{\alpha=\alpha(\alpha',\lambda')}.\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

This equality can be used for analyzing the scheme (in)dependence of the results. In particular, we observe that in L loops the terms proportional to $\mathrm{tr}\big(C(R)^L\big)$ are the same in both sides of Eq. (1) for an arbitrary renormalization prescription. Really, it is evident from Eq. (16) that modifications of the NSVZ relation for all terms which do not contain Yukawa couplings can come only from the denominator. However, all such corrections are proportional either to C_2, $T(R)$, λ, or to products of at least two traces. Therefore, the term $\mathrm{tr}\big(C(R)^L\big)$, which contains a single trace cannot be modified. We have verified that in the three-loop approximation Eq. (16) is in agreement with the results of Ref. [54]. In particular, according to Ref. [54] in the three-loop approximation the terms proportional to $\mathrm{tr}\big(C(R)^3\big)$ are the same in the $\overline{\rm DR}$ and NSVZ schemes.

The results for the $\mathcal{N}=1$ supersymmetric electrodynamics with N_f flavors are obtained if we set

$$C_2 = 0; \qquad C(R)_i{}^j = \delta_i{}^j; \qquad T(R) = 2N_f \qquad r = 1, \tag{17}$$

where the indexes i and j, numerating chiral superfields, take values from 1 to $2N_f$. As a consequence,

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(C(R)^L\right) = 2N_f. \tag{18}$$

Therefore, the scheme-independence of the terms proportional to $\mathrm{tr}\left(C(R)^L\right)$ in the Abelian case leads to the scheme-independence of terms proportional to the first degree N_f, which was proved in Ref. [71].

6 Conclusion

Application of the higher covariant derivative regularization to calculations of quantum corrections in supersymmetric theories allows to solve the long standing problem of obtaining the NSVZ β-function by the direct summation of the supergraphs, at least, in the Abelian case. The NSVZ relation appears for the renormalization group functions defined in terms of the bare coupling constant. If the renormalization group functions are defined in terms of the renormalized coupling constant, application of the higher derivative regularization allows to naturally construct the NSVZ scheme in the Abelian case. Although quantum corrections in non-Abelian theories have a similar structure, so far such a scheme is not constructed in this case. However, we hope that this can be made similarly to the Abelian theory. In this paper we only investigated the scheme dependence of the NVSZ relation for the renormalization group functions defined in terms of the renormalized coupling constant in the non-Abelian case. It is shown that the terms proportional to $\mathrm{tr}\left(C(R)^L\right)$, where L is a number of loops, appeared to be scheme-independent. As a consequence, such terms in the left and right sides of Eq. (1) coincide for an arbitrary renormalization prescription.

Acknowledgements.

The work of A.L.Kataev is supported in part by the Grant NSh-2835.2114.2 and Russian Foundation of Basic Research grant No 14-01-00647. The work of K.V.Stepanyantz was supported by Russian Foundation for Basic Research grant No 14-01-00695.

References

[1] V. A. Novikov, M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B **229** (1983) 381.

[2] V. A. Novikov, M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, Phys. Lett. B **166** (1986) 329; Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **43** (1986) 294; [Yad. Fiz. **43** (1986) 459.]

[3] M. A. Shifman and A. I. Vainshtein, "Instantons versus supersymmetry: Fifteen years later," in M. A. Shifman, "ITEP lectures on particle physics and field theory. Vol. 1, 2," World Sci. Lect. Notes Phys. **62** (1999) 1 [hep-th/9902018].

[4] D. R. T. Jones, Phys. Lett. B **123** (1983) 45.

[5] M. A. Shifman and A. I. Vainshtein, Nucl. Phys. B **277** (1986) 456; Sov. Phys. JETP **64** (1986) 428; [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **91** (1986) 723.]

[6] N. Arkani-Hamed and H. Murayama, JHEP **0006** (2000) 030.

[7] A. I. Vainshtein, V. I. Zakharov and M. A. Shifman, JETP Lett. **42** (1985) 224 [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **42** (1985) 182].

[8] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, Phys. Lett. B **166** (1986) 334.

[9] E. Kraus, C. Rupp and K. Sibold, Nucl. Phys. B **661** (2003) 83.

[10] J. C. Taylor, Nucl. Phys. B **33** (1971) 436.

[11] A. A. Slavnov, Theor. Math. Phys. **10** (1972) 99 [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **10** (1972) 153].

[12] I. L. Buchbinder and K. V. Stepanyantz, Nucl. Phys. B **883** (2014) 20.

[13] J. Hisano and M. A. Shifman, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 5475.

[14] I. Jack and D. R. T. Jones, Phys. Lett. B **415** (1997) 383.

[15] L. V. Avdeev, D. I. Kazakov and I. N. Kondrashuk, Nucl. Phys. B **510** (1998) 289.

[16] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **43** (1986) 1028 [Yad. Fiz. **43** (1986) 1596].

[17] A. A. Slavnov, Nucl. Phys. B **31** (1971) 301.

[18] A. A. Slavnov, Theor.Math.Phys. **13** (1972) 1064 [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **13** (1972) 174].

[19] L. D. Faddeev and A. A. Slavnov, "Gauge Fields. Introduction To Quantum Theory," Nauka, Moscow, 1978 and Front. Phys. **50** (1980) 1 [Front. Phys. **83** (1990) 1].

[20] V. K. Krivoshchekov, Theor. Math. Phys. **36** (1978) 745 [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **36** (1978) 291].

[21] P. C. West, Nucl. Phys. B **268** (1986) 113.

[22] C. P. Martin and F. Ruiz Ruiz, Nucl. Phys. B **436** (1995) 545

[23] D. J. Gross and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30** (1973) 1343.

[24] H. D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30** (1973) 1346.

[25] M. Asorey and F. Falceto, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 5290.

[26] T. D. Bakeyev and A. A. Slavnov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **11** (1996) 1539.

[27] P. I. Pronin and K. Stepanyantz, Phys. Lett. B **414** (1997) 117.

[28] A. A. Soloshenko and K. V. Stepanyantz, Theor. Math. Phys. **140** (2004) 1264 [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **140** (2004) 430].

[29] A. B. Pimenov, E. S. Shevtsova and K. V. Stepanyantz, Phys. Lett. B **686** (2010) 293.

[30] A. V. Smilga and A. Vainshtein, Nucl. Phys. B **704** (2005) 445.

[31] K. V. Stepanyantz, arXiv:1108.1491 [hep-th].

[32] K. V. Stepanyantz, Nucl. Phys. B **852** (2011) 71.

[33] K. V. Stepanyantz, arXiv:1404.6717 [hep-th].

[34] N. N. Bogolyubov and D. V. Shirkov, "Introduction To The Theory Of Quantized Fields," Nauka, Moscow, 1984 [Intersci. Monogr. Phys. Astron. **3** (1959) 1].

[35] G. 't Hooft and M. J. G. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B **44** (1972) 189.

[36] C. G. Bollini and J. J. Giambiagi, Nuovo Cim. B **12** (1972) 20.

[37] J. F. Ashmore, Lett. Nuovo Cim. **4** (1972) 289.

[38] G. M. Cicuta and E. Montaldi, Lett. Nuovo Cim. **4** (1972) 329.

[39] S. Ferrara and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. B **79** (1974) 413.

[40] D. R. T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. B **87** (1975) 127.

[41] W. Siegel, Phys. Lett. B **84** (1979) 193.

[42] A. A. Slavnov, Phys. Lett. B **518** (2001) 195.

[43] A. A. Slavnov, Theor. Math. Phys. **130** (2002) 1 [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **130** (2002) 3].

[44] A. A. Slavnov and K. V. Stepanyantz, Theor. Math. Phys. **135** (2003) 673 [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **135** (2003) 265]

[45] A. A. Slavnov and K. V. Stepanyantz, Theor. Math. Phys. **139** (2004) 599 [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **139** (2004) 179]

[46] W. Siegel, Phys. Lett. B **94** (1980) 37.

[47] L. V. Avdeev, G. A. Chochia and A. A. Vladimirov, Phys. Lett. B **105** (1981) 272.

[48] L. V. Avdeev and A. A. Vladimirov, Nucl. Phys. B **219** (1983) 262.

[49] W. A. Bardeen, A. J. Buras, D. W. Duke and T. Muta, Phys. Rev. D **18** (1978) 3998.

[50] L. V. Avdeev and O. V. Tarasov, Phys. Lett. B **112** (1982) 356.

[51] V. N. Velizhanin, Phys. Lett. B **696** (2011) 560.

[52] L. V. Avdeev, Phys. Lett. B **117** (1982) 317.

[53] V. N. Velizhanin, Nucl. Phys. B **818** (2009) 95.

[54] I. Jack, D. R. T. Jones and C. G. North, Phys. Lett. B **386** (1996) 138.

[55] R. V. Harlander, D. R. T. Jones, P. Kant, L. Mihaila and M. Steinhauser, JHEP **0612** (2006) 024.

[56] I. Jack, D. R. T. Jones, P. Kant and L. Mihaila, JHEP **0709** (2007) 058.

[57] L. Mihaila, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2013** (2013) 607807.

[58] T. A. Ryttov and R. Shrock, Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012) 076009.

[59] I. Jack, D. R. T. Jones and C. G. North, Nucl. Phys. B **486** (1997) 479.

[60] I. Jack, D. R. T. Jones and A. Pickering, Phys. Lett. B **435** (1998) 61.

[61] J. Mas, M. Perez-Victoria and C. Seijas, JHEP **0203** (2002) 049.

[62] D. Z. Freedman, K. Johnson and J. I. Latorre, Nucl. Phys. B **371** (1992) 353.

[63] F. del Aguila, A. Culatti, R. Munoz Tapia and M. Perez-Victoria, Nucl. Phys. B **537** (1999) 561.

[64] F. del Aguila, A. Culatti, R. Munoz-Tapia and M. Perez-Victoria, Nucl. Phys. B **504** (1997) 532.

[65] M. A. Shifman and A. I. Vainshtein, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **44** (1986) 321 [Yad. Fiz. **44** (1986) 498].

[66] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. D **14** (1976) 3432 [Erratum-ibid. D **18** (1978) 2199].

[67] T. R. Morris, D. A. Ross and C. T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B **264** (1986) 111.

[68] T. R. Morris, D. A. Ross and C. T. Sachrajda, Phys. Lett. B **158** (1985) 223.

[69] T. R. Morris, D. A. Ross and C. T. Sachrajda, Phys. Lett. B **172** (1986) 40.

[70] A. L. Kataev and K. V. Stepanyantz, Nucl. Phys. B **875** (2013) 459.

[71] A. L. Kataev and K. V. Stepanyantz, Phys. Lett. B **730** (2014) 184.

[72] A. A. Slavnov, Theor. Math. Phys. **33** (1977) 977 [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **33** (1977) 210].

[73] S. G. Gorishny, A. L. Kataev, S. A. Larin and L. R. Surguladze, Phys. Lett. B **256** (1991) 81.

[74] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, J. H. Kuhn and J. Rittinger, JHEP **1207** (2012) 017.

[75] A. L. Kataev and S. A. Larin, Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **96** (2012) 64 [JETP Lett. **96** (2012) 61].

[76] D. J. Broadhurst, R. Delbourgo and D. Kreimer, Phys. Lett. B **366** (1996) 421.

[77] K. G. Chetyrkin, S. G. Gorishny, A. L. Kataev, S. A. Larin and F. V. Tkachov, Phys. Lett. B **116** (1981) 455.

[78] M. T. Grisaru, W. Siegel and M. Rocek, Nucl. Phys. B **159** (1979) 429.